REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1, 4, and 10 are amended. Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-17 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,697,824 to Bowman-Amuah (hereinafter "Bowman"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by Bowman.

Bowman is directed to a system and method for interacting with a user over a network for personalizing a website (see, col. 2, lines 16-17). As discussed in the Abstract of Bowman, a user is identified and information about the user is collected. A profile of the user is built based on the collected information and a plurality of different contents are managed. The profile and the contents are analyzed in order to match attributes of the profile of the user and attributes of the contents. The contents which have attributes that match the attributes of the profile of the user are then selected and delivered to the user. The user is allowed to manually select which of the delivered contents are depicted on a display. The user is also allowed to selectively position the delivered contents on the display.

In contrast, claim 1 recites:

> One or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a computer program that, when executed by one or more processors of a computing device, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:
> transmitting a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority operating independently of a certificate authority, the enrollment certificate

having an extension added to it by the registration authority on behalf of the computing device.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such transmitting as recited in amended claim 1 is disclosed in Bowman.

In the June 10 Office Action at ¶2, p. 4, Bowman at col. 75, line 65 through col. 76, line 12 is cited as disclosing that a request is transmitted for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority (RA). Also in the June 10 Office Action at ¶2, p. 4, Bowman at Figure 40 is cited as showing the registration authority (RA) operates independently from the certificate authority (CA) since they are remotely located from one another.

Bowman at col. 75, line 65 through col. 76, line 12 discusses that encryption services are provided with a VPN, that a CA administers certificates, and that an RA is used to process certificate requests. However, there is no discussion or mention in this cited portion of Bowman, or in Figure 40, that an enrollment certificate has an extension added to it by the registration authority on behalf of the computing device as recited in Bowman at col. 75, line 65 through col. 76, line 12 claim 1. Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that Bowman cannot disclose transmitting a request for an enrollment certificate for a virtual private network to a registration authority operating independently of a certificate authority, the enrollment certificate having an extension added to it by the registration authority on behalf of the computing device as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is allowable over Bowman.

lee❀hayes ⁖ ⬦⬦⬦⬦⬦⬦⬦⬦   7   Application No. 10/801,333

Given that claims 2 and 3 depend from amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 3 are likewise allowable over Bowman for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,715,073 to An et al. (hereinafter "An"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, and 17 are not anticipated by An.

An is directed to a secure server using public key registration and methods of operation (see, Title). As discussed in the Abstract of An, An describes a secure-end-to-end communication system for electronic business system and method of operation, e.g., the Internet, includes a web server-vault controller having personal storage vaults in the controller for users, registration and certification authorities. Each personal vault runs programs on the controller under a unique UNIX user ID. Data storage is provided by the controller wherein the storage is owned by the same user ID assigned to the vault. A registration authority running as a software application in the controller processes requests to issue, renew and revoke digital certificates issued by a certification authority using two pairs of public-private keys. The registration authority interacts with the vault controller to decide whether an applicant qualifies to receive a digital certificate. The certification authority running as software application in the controller includes a certificate management system that provides services such as issuing, revoking, suspending, resuming, and renewing a user's right to digital certificates.

In contrast, amended claim 4 recites:

A method implemented at a registration authority, the method comprising:

receiving, from a device, a get certificate authority certificate request;

generating a response including a certificate of the registration authority that is used by the registration authority to digitally sign or encrypt data; and

returning the response to the device.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such receiving, generating, or returning as recited in amended claim 4 is disclosed in An.

In the June 10 Office Action at ¶3, p. 5, An at col. 12, lines 22-30 and col. 13, lines 50-52 is cited as disclosing a method implemented at a registration authority (RA) wherein a vault agent (device) sends a request for a certificate from a certificate authority (CA). The RA receives the request and then forwards the request to the CA and the CA then generates a certificate (response) and sends it to the RA which then sends it back to the remote agent (device).

In contrast, in claim 4 a get certificate authority certificate request is received from a device, but a certificate of the registration authority that is used by the registration authority to digitally sign or encrypt data is returned to the device. There is no discussion or mention in the cited portion of An of the remote agent requesting a certificate of one entity (the CA), but having returned to it the certificate of another entity (the RA). Without any such discussion or mention, Applicant respectfully submits that An cannot disclose the method of amended claim 4.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 4 is allowable over An.

lee@hayes pllc 509-324-9256 9 Application No. 10/801,333

PAGE 11/14 * RCVD AT 8/9/2005 4:47:30 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/24 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:509 323 8979 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-36

Given that claims 6, 8, and 16 depend from amended claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 8, and 16 are likewise allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 4.

With respect to amended claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that, similar to the discussion above regarding amended claim 4, An does not disclose the receiving, generating, and returning of amended claim 10. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 10 is allowable over An.

Given that claims 12, 14, and 17 depend from amended claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12, 14, and 17 are likewise allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 10.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over An. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 11 are not obvious over An.

Claim 5 depends from amended claim 4 and Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 4 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is allowable over An at least because of its dependency on amended claim 4.

Claim 11 depends from amended claim 10 and Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 10 is allowable over An for at least the reasons

discussed above. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is allowable over An at least because of its dependency on amended claim 10.

Claims 9 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over An in view of Housley et al. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 9 and 15 are not obvious over An in view of Housley et al.

Claim 9 depends from amended claim 4 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 4. Housley is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of An discussed above. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable over An in view of Housley et al.

Claim 15 depends from amended claim 10 and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over An for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 10. Housley is not cited as curing, and does not cure, the deficiencies of An discussed above. Thus, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 15 is allowable over An in view of Housley et al.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/801,333

Conclusion

Claims 1-6, 8-12, and 14-17 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8/9/05

By: _____
Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256